

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:

NORTH SHORE GAS COMPANY

Petition pursuant to Rider VBA) No. 12-0239
of schedule of rates for gas) (consolidated w/
service to initiate a proceeding) 12-0240)
to determine the accuracy of)
the Rider VBA reconciliation)
statement)

THE PEOPLES GAS, LIGHT AND COKE
COMPANY

Petition pursuant to Rider VBA)
of schedule of rates for gas)
service to initiate a proceeding)
to determine the accuracy of)
the Rider VBA reconciliation)
statement)

Chicago, Illinois
November 13th, 2012

Met, pursuant to notice, at 11:00 a.m.

BEFORE :

MR. JOHN RILEY, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

BY: MS. DIANNA HATHHORN

527 East Capitol Avenue

Springfield, Illinois 62701

(217) 782-4654

for the Illinois Commerce Commission

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

NORTH SHORE GAS COMPANY and PEOPLES GAS, LIGHT AND
COKE COMPANY

BY: MS. MARY KLYASHEFF
130 East Randolph Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 240-4470

for North Shore Gas Company and Peoples Gas,
Light and Coke Company

L.A. COURT REPORTERS
Steven J. Brickey
License No. 084-004675

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

I N D E X

			Re-	Re-	By
Witnesses:	Direct	Cross	direct	cross	Examiner
None.					

E X H I B I T S

Number	For Identification	In Evidence
NSG 1.0	7	8
PGL 1.0	7	8
NS-PGL 1.0	7	8
Staff 1.0 R	9	10

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

JUDGE RILEY: Pursuant to the direction of the Illinois Commerce Commission, I call docket -- consolidated dockets 12-0239 and 12-0240. Docket 12-0239 is a petition by North Shore Gas Company pursuant to Rider VBA of scheduled rates of gas service to initiate a proceeding to determine the accuracy of the Rider VBA of reconciliation statement.

Docket 12-0240 is a petition by the Peoples Gas, Light and Coke Company pursuant to Rider VBA of schedule of rates for gas service to initiate a proceeding to determine the accuracy of the Rider VBA reconciliation statement.

And, Ms. Hathhorn, is it my understanding that you are appearing now -- there is no staff appearance by counsel?

MS. HATHHORN: That's correct, your Honor.

JUDGE RILEY: All right. Let the record reflect that Dianna Hathhorn, Commission staff, is participating in this proceeding

1 telephonically and for the -- counsel, are you
2 appearing for North Shore and for Peoples?

3 MS. KLYASHEFF: Yes, your Honor.

4 JUDGE RILEY: Would you please enter
5 an appearance for the record?

6 MS. KLYASHEFF: Appearing for North
7 Shore Gas Company and the Peoples Gas, Light and
8 Coke Company, Mary Klyasheff, 130 East Randolph
9 Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

10 JUDGE RILEY: Thank you. And this
11 matter was set for a status. Ms. Klyasheff, I'm
12 going to turn to you first and what is the status
13 of this matter now from petitioner's standpoint?

14 MS. KLYASHEFF: From petitioner's
15 standpoint, staff filed its testimony and raised
16 no issues so North Shore and Peoples Gas would
17 have no rebuttal to that and we would be prepared
18 to go to an evidentiary hearing.

19 JUDGE RILEY: Ms. Hathhorn?

20 MS. HATHHORN: I concur, your Honor.

21 JUDGE RILEY: Okay. There are no
22 contested issues in either of these dockets then

1 that's my understanding?

2 MS. KLYASHEFF: That's correct, your
3 Honor.

4 MS. HATHHORN: Yes.

5 JUDGE RILEY: There are no
6 interveners. Let's go off the record for a
7 second.

8 (Whereupon, a discussion was had
9 off the record.)

10 JUDGE RILEY: Let's go back on the
11 record. All right. The parties have agreed that
12 there are no contested issues in this matter and
13 that there is really no reason to prolong it. So
14 for that reason we are going to move to the matter
15 of the exhibits and admissibility. Let me start
16 with -- beginning with the petitioners.

17 MS. KLYASHEFF: North Shore Gas
18 Company and the Peoples Gas, Light and Coke
19 Company wish to move for the admission of the
20 direct testimony of Karen A. Tiedmann.
21 Ms. Tiedmann's direct testimony on behalf of North
22 Shore was marked for identification as NSG Exhibit

1 1.0 to which was appended NSG Exhibit 1.1.

2 (Document marked as NSG Exhibit
3 No. 1.0 for identification.)

4 MS. KLYASHEFF: The testimony was
5 filed on E-docket March 28th, 2012. On behalf of
6 the Peoples Gas, Light and Coke Company, I move
7 for the admission of the direct testimony of Karen
8 A. Tiedmann with that testimony marked for
9 identification as PGL Exhibit 1.0 to which was
10 amended PGL Exhibit 1.1.

11 (Document marked as PGL Exhibit
12 No. 1.0 for identification.)

13 MS. KLYASHEFF: That was also filed
14 on E-docket on March 28th, 2012. Ms. Tiedmann's
15 affidavit for this consolidated proceeding was
16 marked for identification as NS-PGL Exhibit 1.0
17 and it was filed on E-docket November 8th of 2012.

18 (Document marked as NS-PGL
19 Exhibit No. 1.0 for
20 identification.)

21 JUDGE RILEY: And I guess my only
22 question there is there are two exhibits marked

1 1.0.

2 MS. KLYASHEFF: One of them is NS
3 1.0, one of them is PGL 1.0 and the other is
4 NS-PGL 1.0.

5 JUDGE RILEY: Okay. I see the
6 distinction.

7 MS. KLYASHEFF: Which is confusing.

8 JUDGE RILEY: Is that all the
9 petitioner's exhibits?

10 MS. KLYASHEFF: Yes, sir.

11 JUDGE RILEY: Ms. Hathhorn, is there
12 any objection to the admission of the exhibits as
13 identified into evidence?

14 MS. HATHHORN: No objection, your
15 Honor.

16 JUDGE RILEY: Then petitioner's
17 exhibits as identified are admitted into evidence.
18 And one thing I did want to ask -- I have an
19 Attachment B revised. Did that belong to --

20 MS. KLYASHEFF: Petitioners filed
21 certain additional information with their
22 petition. The Commission required us to show

1 certain data about the operation of the rider. We
2 do that via the petition, but do not request that
3 it be admitted into evidence.

4 JUDGE RILEY: All right. And is it
5 my understanding that completes the petitioner's
6 case in chief?

7 MS. KLYASHEFF: Yes, it does, your
8 Honor.

9 JUDGE RILEY: Thank you.
10 Ms. Hathhorn, turning to you now. I note you have
11 filed an Exhibit 1.0 and then a revised Exhibit
12 1.0, is that correct?

13 MS. HATHHORN: Yes.

14 JUDGE RILEY: I take it the revised
15 Exhibit 1.0 supercedes the original 1.0?

16 MS. HATHHORN: Yes, it's marked
17 1.0R.

18 (Document marked as Staff
19 Exhibit No. 1.0R for
20 identification.)

21 JUDGE RILEY: And --

22 MS. HATHHORN: And as I identified

1 in my affidavit, which is marked as ICC Staff
2 Exhibit 1.1, that I would seek leave to enter my
3 revised direct testimony into the record.

4 JUDGE RILEY: Hold on. So you're
5 making a motion to admit Exhibit 1.0 and Exhibit
6 1.1?

7 MS. HATHHORN: A motion for Staff
8 Exhibit 1.0R.

9 JUDGE RILEY: Excuse me, yes.

10 MS. HATHHORN: And 1.1.

11 JUDGE RILEY: Does petitioner have
12 any objection to the admission of Staff Exhibit's
13 1.0R and Exhibit 1.1 into evidence?

14 MS. KLYASHEFF: No objection.

15 JUDGE RILEY: Then Staff Exhibit's
16 1.0R and Exhibit's 1.1 are admitted into evidence.
17 Now, with regard to -- Ms. Klyasheff, are you
18 familiar with the agreed order that Ms.
19 Hathhorn referred to?

20 MS. KLYASHEFF: Yes, your Honor.

21 JUDGE RILEY: It is my understanding
22 that it is an actual agreed order?

1 MS. KLYASHEFF: It is an agreed form
2 of order and petitioners would propose to file it
3 with your leave.

4 JUDGE RILEY: Okay. That would be
5 fine. No objection to that, Ms. Hathhorn?

6 MS. HATHHORN: Correct, your Honor.

7 JUDGE RILEY: All right. Then once
8 I have that I can proceed on a consolidated order
9 for the Commission's consideration.

10 MS. KLYASHEFF: Very good. Thank
11 you.

12 JUDGE RILEY: All right. Is there
13 anything further from the petitioners?

14 MS. KLYASHEFF: Nothing, your Honor.

15 JUDGE RILEY: Ms. Hathhorn, anything
16 further from staff?

17 MS. HATHHORN: No, your Honor.

18 JUDGE RILEY: Then I will direct the
19 court reporter to mark this matter heard and
20 taken.

21

22